

Errata for the Final Program Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed California High-Speed Train System

1.1 Introduction

As a part of the California High-Speed Rail Authority's and the Federal Railroad Administration's review of the Final environmental impact report/environmental impact statement (EIR/EIS), several minor corrections were identified. These corrections make insignificant modifications to the EIR/EIS, are not considered significant new information, and do not change the analysis or conclusions of the Program EIR/EIS. These corrections merely clarify and amplify issues adequately addressed in the Final Program EIR/EIS. These corrections do not trigger the need to recirculate the document, per the requirements of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines (CA Pub. Res. Code Section 21092.1; CA Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15088.5), and do not trigger the need to prepare a supplement, per the requirements of the U.S. Council on Environmental Quality National Environmental Policy Act regulations (40 CFR 1502.9(c)(1)).

1.2 Corrections

The table below shows the corrections to the Final Program EIR/EIS. Additions are shown in underline, deletions are shown in strikethrough, and notes are shown in italics.

Chapter	Location	Page	Change
Chapter 3, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Strategies	Section 3.4, Noise, subsection 3.4.6, B. Vibration Mitigation	3.4-25	<p>1. <u>Specify the use of train and track technologies that minimize ground vibration such as state of the art suspensions, resilient track pads, tie pads, ballast mats or floating slabs.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Phase construction activity, use low impact construction techniques and avoid use of vibrating construction equipment where possible to avoid vibration impacts.</u></p>
	Section 3.5, Energy, subsection 3.5.4, Operational (Direct) Energy	3.5-14	By contrast, the proposed HST Alternative would increase direct energy consumption by 40% <u>9%</u> over existing conditions, a much slower rate than the Modal or No Project Alternatives.
	Section 3.12, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Table 3.12-1	3.12-20	Medium <u>Undetermined</u> (<i>applies to each occurrence in the HST row of the Paleontological column</i>)

Chapter	Location	Page	Change
	Table 3.14 1, title	3.14-10	Summary of Hydrologic Resources within Potentially Affected Areas
	Table 3.15-1, title	3.15-21	Summary of Potential Impacts on Biological Resources within the Potentially Affected Area for Modal and HST Alternatives
	Section 3.17, Cumulative Impacts Evaluation	3.17-14	<p><i>Delete last paragraph in subsection and replace with the following.</i></p> <p><u>Program-level mitigation for Modal and HST Alternative contributions to the cumulative impacts to 4(f) and 6(f) resources, as discussed in Chapter 3 (Sections 3.16.6, 3.16.7, 3.16.8), include sound barriers, visual buffers/landscaping, and modification of transportation access to/egress from the resource. Some of these measures could include design modifications or controls on construction schedules, phasing, and activities.</u></p> <p><u>Planning efforts would be undertaken as a part of the project-level documentation phase to minimize harm to the Section 4(f) and 6(f) resources. At this second-tier review, it is expected that, for the proposed HST alignments, most of the impacts to individual park resources will be avoided or mitigated to a less-than-significant level, thereby minimizing contributions to cumulative impacts to public parks and recreation resources. At a project level, mitigation measures that may be taken to mitigate potential adverse environmental impacts include beautification measures, replacement of land or structures or their equivalents on or near their existing site(s), tunneling, cut and cover, cut and fill, treatment of embankments, planting, screening, creating wildlife corridors, acquisition of land for preservation, installation of noise barriers, and establishment of pedestrian or bicycle paths. Other potential mitigation strategies could be identified during the public input process.</u></p>
Chapter 5, Economic Growth and Related Impacts	Subsection 5.3.3, Statewide Comparison of Alternatives	5-10	Urbanized areas in California are expected to grow by 48% between 2004 2002 and 2035 under the No Project Alternative, as shown in Table 5.3-3.
	B. Detail for HST Alternative	5-13	The HST Alternative would also need less land than the Modal Alternative; in 2035, the HST Alternative would consume approximately 68,100 ac (27,559 ha) fewer, or 1.4% less, of non- urbanized land than the Modal Alternative.

Chapter	Location	Page	Change
Chapter 7, Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impacts	Section 7.1, Adverse Unavoidable Potentially Significant Impacts	7-2	<p><i>Add the following subsection:</i></p> <p>7.1.4 Cumulative Impacts</p> <p>The Modal and HST Alternatives would each commit the use of land and natural resources to a transportation right-of-way causing significant and unavoidable direct impacts, as described in 7.1.2 . The construction of either the Modal or HST Alternatives could, in addition, cause a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts related to land use, agricultural lands, aesthetics and visual resources, cultural and paleontological resources, biological resources and wetlands, and public parks and recreation resources. As with the direct impacts, potential cumulative impacts would need to be further studied and clarified in the next stage of project design and environmental review, when more specific information would be available on the right-of-way needed for proposed alignments and station locations, and on the specific properties potentially affected. The objective at the project-specific stage of analysis would be to identify design options (plans and profiles) that would avoid or substantially reduce the contribution to the significant cumulative impacts, to the extent feasible.</p>
	Section 7.3.2, Significant Unavoidable Adverse Effects, second paragraph	7-4	Depending on the alignment options that may ultimately be selected, potentially significant unavoidable effects can be expected at some locations within the proposed HST system in the general environmental categories of agricultural lands, biological resources and wetlands, hydrology and water resources, and cultural resources, and cumulative impacts.
	Table 7.3-1, title	7-6	<p><i>Add the following footnote to table title:</i></p> <p>¹ Short-term impacts, such as construction-related impacts, are not described.</p>
	Table 7.3-1, Traffic and Circulation row, After Mitigation column	7-6	potentially significant/ unavoidable
	Table 7.3-1, Land Use row, Before Mitigation column	7-8	Potentially significant/ unavoidable
	Table 7.3-1, Land Use row, After Mitigation column	7-8	<u>Potentially significant/unavoidable</u>
	Table 7.3-1, Visual Quality row, After Mitigation column	7-9	Potentially less than significant
	Table 7.3-1, Hydrology and Water Resources row, After Mitigation column	7-11	potentially significant/ unavoidable
	Table 7.3-1, Section 4(f) and 6(f) (Public Parks and Recreation) row, After Mitigation column	7-11	Potentially less than significant / Potentially significant/ unavoidable <u>indirect impacts</u>

Chapter	Location	Page	Change
	Table 7.3-1, Public Utilities row, Modal Alternative column	7-13	Potential conflicts with 834 <u>833</u> utilities.
	Table 7.3-1, Public Utilities row, HST Alternative column	7-13	Potential conflicts with 545 to 842 <u>511 to 842</u> utilities, depending on alignments.
Summary	S.5 Key Findings	S-8	The key findings of this Draft <u>Final</u> Program EIR/EIS indicate that taking no action under the No Project Alternative would not meet the intercity travel needs projected for the future (2020) as population continues to grow, and would fail to meet purpose and need or the objectives of a statewide HST system.